

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/649,396	08/27/2003	Alexander G. Lastovich	P-5369B	6079	
20200	590 03/23/200 HET, VP AND CHIE	EXAMINER			
•	CINSON AND COMP	STIGELL, THEODORE J			
1 BECTON DRIVE, MC 110 FRANKLIN LAKES, NJ 07417-1880			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		3763			
SHORTENED STATUTORY	PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVER	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MON	THS	03/23/2007	PAP	PER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

				L
Office Action Summary		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
		10/649,396	LASTOVICH ET AL.	
		Examiner	Art Unit	
		Theodore J. Stigell	3763	
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app r Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address	
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failui Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DO ISSION OF THE MAILING THE	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDO	ON. timely filed om the mailing date of this communication. NED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status				
2a)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>05 Ja</u> This action is FINAL . 2b) This Since this application is in condition for allowar	action is non-final.	rosecution as to the merits is	*
	closed in accordance with the practice under $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{E}}$	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11,	453 O.G. 213.	
Dispositi	on of Claims	•		
5) 6) 7)	Claim(s) <u>1-30</u> is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>1-30</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	wn from consideration.		
Applicati	on Papers			
10)	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	epted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Stion is required if the drawing(s) is a	tee 37 CFR 1.85(a). Objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority u	inder 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12)[/ a)[Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureausee the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applica rity documents have been recei u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ation No ved in this National Stage	
	4.5			
2) Notic 3) Inform	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summa Paper No(s)/Mail 5) Notice of Informa 6) Other:	Date	

Art Unit: 3763

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-7 and 9-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sage et al. (EP 1086719). Sage discloses a microprotrusion array (10) for the rotational delivery (a user can certainly make a rotational movement when using the device) of a therapeutic fluid substance into tissue comprising at least one platen (12), said platen comprising a microprotrusion surface, and a platen edge, wherein said microprotrusion surface is suitable for attaching a plurality of microprotrusions (14) thereon or therein; a plurality of microprotrusions attached in or on said microprotrusion surface of said platen in a radial array (the microprotrusions extend in columns and rows and therefore extend in parallel rays), wherein each of said microprotrusions is a frustoconical protrusion and comprises at least one scraping edge; and at least one therapeutic fluid substance retaining means, said therapeutic substance retaining means selected from the group consisting of intra-microprotrusion spacing, one or more recesses between said microprotrusions, one or more areas devoid of microprotrusions, one or more areas of reduced microprotrusion density, one or more areas of microprotrusions attached to the platen in a pattern adapted to direct said substance toward the interior of said array,

Art Unit: 3763

one or more channels in the platen microprotrusion attachment surface, and combinations thereof, wherein said therapeutic fluid substance retaining means releasably retains said therapeutic fluid substance as the array is used, thereby allowing any therapeutic fluid substance which is not immediately delivered into tissue to remain in the array (the microprotrusions will create a channel in the skin and therefore will retain the medication, wherein the platen edge is smooth and can be beveled or radiused, wherein the microprotrusion surface is planar and non-uniform, wherein the microprotrusions have channels disposed in between that extend in multiple directions, and wherein the microprotrusions can vary in length between 5 and 250 microns.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of

Art Unit: 3763

the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Guye (2,688,970) in view of Sage et al. (6,835,184). Guye discloses a microprotrusion array and method of delivering a therapeutic substance via an abrader device comprising all of the limitations recited in claims 1 and 25. Guye does not disclose that the microprotrusions (2) have a frustoconical shape as is recited in both independent claims. Sage discloses a microprotrusion device that includes frustonically shaped microprotrusions and teaches that this configuration is useful in abrading the skin.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the microprotrusions of Guye with the frustoconical shape of Sage to make a more effective vaccinator system.

Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Garstein et al. (US 2002/0045859) in view of Sage et al. (6,835,184). See Figures 21 and 22 and the respective portions of the Specification. Garstein discloses a microprotrusion array and method of delivering a therapeutic substance via an abrader device comprising all of the limitations recited in claims 1 and 25. Garstein does not disclose that the microprotrusions (222) have a frustoconical shape as is recited in both

Art Unit: 3763

independent claims. Sage discloses a microprotrusion device that includes frustonically shaped microprotrusions and teaches that this configuration is useful in abrading the skin. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the microprotrusions of Garstein with the frustoconical shape of Sage to make a more effective micorabrader system.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-30 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 3763

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Theodore J. Stigell whose telephone number is 571-272-8759. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

Page 6

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nicholas Lucchesi can be reached on 571-272-4977. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Theodore J. Stigell